

above, independent claims 1 and 3 have been amended to recite a polarizing plate formed over the resin; and an insulating film adhered to the polarizing plate with an adhesive, which is believed to distinguish the present claims from the prior art of record.

Independent claims 2 and 4 have been amended to recite that a plurality of light-emitting devices are formed over the first plastic substrate. Figure 7 of Okazaki appears to teach an LED block body 4, which might be regarded as a substrate. That is, the block body 4 has an LED in it. All drawings in Okazaki are described as having one LED. Okazaki appears to disclose a light-emitting diode (LED) chip. The Official Action asserts that Okazaki teaches "a first substrate (16) a light emitting diode (Column 3, lines 17-30) formed in the concave portion (20) of the first substrate" (page 3, Paper No. 20081015). The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the assertions in the Official Action. In Figure 10 of Okazaki, the reference "16" refers to means for positioning and fixing the LED substrate (see column 6, lines 45-52). The process of forming the LED substrate is shown in Figure 9. After finishing the process in Figure 9, this substrate is cut down to chip size by cutting along the lines C and D shown in Figure 11. Then, the manufacturing process of LED chips is completed (see column 7, lines 13-15). As such, although sixteen (4x4) LEDs are positioned in the process substrate of Figure 9, one LED is situated on an LED chip. Therefore, Okazaki does not appear to teach or suggest a plurality of light-emitting devices formed over a first plastic substrate.

Also, in Okazaki, each device chip 4 is mounted and fixed by a soldering an electric circuit 13 of a lighting apparatus (see Figure 13 and column 5, line 59, to column 6, line 6). Okazaki's LED chip is used with an LCD backlight system (see column 1, lines 6-11). Therefore, it is not clear why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention would have had a reason to apply the concavity of a block body for a backlight system to the prior art to achieve the features of the present invention.

Since Yamazaki, Okazaki and Shiraishi do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly,

reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

The Official Action rejects dependent claims 56-59 as obvious based on the combination of Yamazaki, Ozaki, Shiraishi and U.S. Publication No. 2001/0000439 to Ohta. The Official Action rejects dependent claim 5 as obvious based on the combination of Yamazaki, Okazaki, Shiraishi and U.S. Patent No. 4,648,691 to Oguchi. The Official Action rejects dependent claim 6 as obvious based on the combination of Yamazaki, Okazaki, Shiraishi and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0041348 to Yokoyama. The Official Action rejects dependent claims 8, 10, 12 and 14 as obvious based on the combination of Yamazaki, Okazaki, Shiraishi and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0130985 to Weindorf. The Official Action rejects dependent claims 15, 17 and 18 as obvious based on the combination of Yamazaki, Okazaki, Shiraishi and U.S. Patent No. 6,331,381 to Chaudhari. The Official Action rejects dependent claim 16 as obvious based on the combination of Yamazaki, Okazaki, Shiraishi and U.S. Patent No. 5,781,263 to Kawagoe. The Official Action rejects dependent claim 19 as obvious based on the combination of Yamazaki, Okazaki, Shiraishi and U.S. Patent No. 4,202,607 to Washizuka. The Official Action rejects dependent claim 20 as obvious based on the combination of Yamazaki, Okazaki, Shiraishi and U.S. Patent No. 4,536,014 to Boutaleb. The Applicant respectfully submits that the references relied upon to allegedly teach the features of the various dependent claims do not cure the above-referenced deficiencies in Yamazaki, Okazaki and Shiraishi.

New dependent claim 60 has been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicant is entitled. For the reasons stated above and already of record, the Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 60 is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789